



**Minutes**  
**WATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMISSION**  
**Monthly Meeting**  
April 03, 2014, 9:00 AM  
City of Sunrise  
Grand Ballroom  
Sunrise, FL 33351

Roll Call

1. Call to Order – Tim Sargent, WRAC Chairman

Mr. Sargent called the meeting to order at 9:12 am and welcomed fellow Governing Board members including WRAC Vice-Chair Kevin Powers, and Jim Moran. Mr. Sargent announced the Governing Board Chairman's appointment of Jim Moran as new WRAC Chairman with his responsibilities officially beginning on May 6, 2014.

Mr. Powers thanked Mr. Sargent for his service and presented him with a handmade paperweight commemorating his service as WRAC Chairman.

Mr. Sargent acknowledged several local elected officials in attendance to address the WRAC. Officials spoke in appreciation of District involvement in water resource related initiatives in their community:

- Officials in attendance included:
  - Broward County Mayor, Barbara Sharief
  - City of Sunrise Assistant Mayor, Donald Rosen and
  - City of Coconut Creek Mayor Lisa Aronson

2. WRAC Member Issues

Members shared their sentiments regarding Mr. Sargent's service to the WRAC and the Governing Board and welcomed Mr. Moran as the new Chair.

WRAC Recreation Issues Chair, Newton Cook provided a report to the WRAC from the Issues meeting held on March 17th.

Jane Graham, Audubon Florida, asked that an invasive species management update be given at next month's joint WRAC / Task Force meeting.

Mark Perry, Florida Oceanographic Society, asked members that visit Tallahassee during this legislative session to voice their concerns to the legislature regarding water resource issues.

Doug Bournique, Indian River Citrus League, expressed concerns regarding the large volumes of water being released to tide from the ten mile creek structure.

Josh Kellam, The ESG Companies, stated that there are projects that can be implemented that can hold water and WRAC should continue to work towards greater storage capacity.

James Erskine, Miccosukee Tribe of Indians, highlighted the Tribe's outreach and science program "Miccosukee Everglades Study" which annually provides a week of daily Everglades outings through tribal lands located in Highlands county for up to 80 school children, tribal members and other interested parties. This event has taken place annually for over thirty years and provides an education to the community about water related issues affecting the Everglades and the Tribe.

Chad Kennedy, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, announced that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced that it plans to withdraw the federal numeric nutrient criteria, which is the first step that will allow the state to move forward with its own numeric nutrient criteria.

Ashley Tripp, Alternate to Mary Ann Martin, announced that an annual festival would be held on Torrey Island and encouraged WRAC members to attend.

Barbara Miedema, Sugar Cane Growers Cooperative of Florida, asked for time on the agenda to discuss items to be placed on the upcoming Joint WRAC/Task Force agenda.

Shannon Estenoz, Department of Interior, welcomed a discussion regarding agenda items to add to the upcoming joint WRAC/Task Force meeting. Ms. Estenoz stated that the Task Force is working to elevate the exotic or invasive species issue this year and a discussion would be on the May 7<sup>th</sup> Task Force agenda.

#### Public Comment

None.

3. John Mitnik, Bureau Chief, Engineering and Construction Bureau, highlighted local projects of interest including the ongoing Hillsboro Canal Maintenance project and the completion of repairs to the East Coast Protective Levee within Broward County. Mr. Mitnik highlighted that the District has submitted the certification of the levee to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

#### WRAC Comment

Chuck Collins, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC), asked if there was any type of vegetation that could remain on the levees for wildlife use given FEMA and United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) certification criteria. Mr. Mitnik stated that a national conversation has been ongoing regarding vegetation that could remain on levees for wildlife protection and that the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) just recently released interim guidelines that addresses this issue.

James Erskine asked what determined whether a grass reinforced mat or articulated concrete would be used for levee stabilization. Mr. Mitnik informed the group that the naturally occurring substrate of the levees determined which material would be used. If the material already in place is sandy it is more conducive to using turf reinforcement mats and if it is rocky then concrete is more appropriate. Mr. Erskine also asked if the report that will be issued as a result of the levee improvements would include any anticipated flow volumes or increased capacity of the canal system. Mr. Mitnik stated that there was a study conducted on a 1500 foot reach located just in front of the water control structure based on the original conveyance design and the purpose of this project was to restore the system to its designed conveyance capacity.

Joe Capra, CAPTEC Engineering, Inc., stated that he would like to see more maintenance projects such as these and construction projects take place within the next ten to fifteen years. Mr. Capra stated that local

governments also take on these types of stabilization projects and have had issues with the turf reinforcement mats failing. He suggested that District staff reach out to these local governments to share lessons-learned when undertaking stabilization projects.

#### Public Comment

None

4. Tom Teets, Office Chief, Federal Policy and Coordination, provided a presentation about the Central Everglades Planning Project Integrated Project Implementation Report and Environmental Impact Statement (CEPP PIR/EIS)

#### WRAC Comment

Mike Collins, Florida Keys Fishing Guides Association, stated that he represents the Florida Bay Initiative, a non-for-profit that has been in existence for the last twenty years, on this issue and his comments are consistent with comments made on the draft PIR which reflect the same position the group took twenty years ago. Mr. Collins expressed concerns with the CEPP process, in particular the steady erosion of the public's ability to have input and lack of accountability of federal and state entities.

Mr. Collins stated that he is not filing any lawsuits today and noted that Mr. Teets presentation heavily referenced items in the PIR and asked where the actual PIR was located. Mr. Teets stated that the PIR is not public right now, however, would be provided to Governing Board members prior to their April 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. Mr. Teets noted that the process did call for the PIR to be released at this time. Mr. Collins also stated that key issues that the Governing Board requested resolutions for at their August meeting had not been fully addressed.

Mr. Collins raised concerns regarding the water quality proponent that would require additional facility construction and the statutory requirement that the District provide half of the state portion of the funding. Mr. Collins recalled that in the past the District was not authorized to guarantee its portion of project funding from legislatively appropriated monies. Mr. Collins stated that appears that the letter of financial capability incorrectly takes into account legislative appropriations. Mr. Collins suggested that staff discuss the process with legislators.

Mr. Collins stated that he had not seen responses to comments made during the draft PIR public comment period. Mr. Collins specifically mentioned comments related to the appropriateness of changes made for the CEPP abbreviated process. He stated that some of the changes seemed to impact NEEPA requirements.

Michelle Diffenderfer, Seminole Tribe of Florida, acknowledged the ongoing discussions between the Tribe, Corps and District staff regarding the need to provide more water to the western basins including the Big Cypress Basin. Although she appreciated the parallel efforts she expressed concern regarding the way the resolution was drafted as it referenced the Seminole Tribe's support since the Tribe has not had an opportunity to view the final PIR to ensure that their concerns were addressed. Ms. Diffenderfer wanted to make sure that the Tribe's concerns regarding water supply and the need for water to address environmental needs was clearly recorded and addressed before the Tribe's name was used in the resolution showing support.

Newton Cook, United Waterfowlers, stated that specific numbers referencing 210,000 acre feet of water per year should not be included in the resolution since the amount of increase cannot truly be determined. Mr. Cook also questioned whether or not this project would end up like Acceler8.

Chuck Collins agreed that the 210,000 acre feet should not be included in the resolution. Mr. Collins asked for an analysis of the CEPP accelerated process after approval to evaluate the efficacy of the entire process and possibly determine where the process could be used again in other Everglades Restoration projects.

Neale Montgomery, Pavese Law Firm, questioned the timing and possible escalating costs of CEPP. Ms. Montgomery asked how this project fit in with the Project Prioritization exercise concurrently taking place and noted that coming to a resolution on CEPP may be too fast to make sound decisions.

Barbara Miedema stated that since she has not had a chance to look at the final PIR she is not as comfortable moving forward as those who may have seen it. Ms. Miedema also stated that one of the clauses in the resolution says that the Lake Okeechobee Service Area (LOSA) will be made whole from a water supply standpoint. Ms. Miedema stated that the only way to reach “wholeness” is for the Lake Okeechobee Regulation Schedule (LORS) to be modified. She stated that going back on the benchmark state and federal savings clauses enacted by Congress in 2000 was going backwards for the agricultural community and she would like to see some recognition that LORS would need to be modified if the level of service to LOSA was to be made whole in the PIR. Ms. Miedema stated that this is also dependent on the Indian River Lagoon suite of projects being completed first and should be hard-wired into sequencing. Ms. Miedema said that going back to the passage of CERP in 2000 the LOSA had a 1 in 10 level of service and currently there is a 1 in 6 level of service as a result of LORS 2008. Ms. Miedema stated that the agricultural community could not afford to have more water supply taken away without recognition that there is a risk involved. She asked that it be recognized that this is the only way that the savings clause would be made whole. Ms. Miedema said she attended the Technical Oversight Committee (TOC) earlier in the week and heard Ernie Marks say that the Appendix A Sub-Team anticipates conceptual changes to monitoring methodologies in Appendix A as short-term, mid-range, and long-term projects or operational regimes come on line. Ms. Miedema told the group that this is the level of assurance in existence and is not a resolution to Appendix A, but a verbal acknowledgment that changes may need to be made going forward as necessary.

Adam Gelber, Atkins North America, Inc., agreed with Ms. Montgomery that coming to the current CEPP resolution may have happened too fast and that not enough data was available to move forward. Mr. Gelber conveyed his concerns regarding habitat units in the Florida Bay in relation to CEPP. He stated that CEPP falls short in delivering enough water to the areas in the Bay that would most benefit habitat units and significantly improve fisheries. Mr. Gelber recommended that the Governing Board add specific language that discusses benefits to Florida Bay.

Shannon Estenoz responded to Mr. Chuck Collins’ comments regarding the accelerated process used for CEPP. Ms. Estenoz stated that the Task Force hosted an enhanced public involvement process in addition to the public opportunities built into the process. She shared that the Task Force held sixteen day-long workshops and the group would be evaluating that portion of the process through anonymous surveys although she had received positive feedback from participants.

Jane Graham expressed appreciation on behalf of Audubon Florida and other environmental stakeholders for the expedited and inclusive process. Ms. Graham stated that this type of process she be used in the future as a showcase of an expedited process. Ms. Graham addressed Ms. Montgomery’s concern regarding the timing of moving forward now by pointing to a slide from the presentation that showed the timeliness of Governing Board approval now so that the item can make it before the Civil Works Review Board in Washington, DC by April 22. Ms. Graham stated that the resolution appeared to be the work two agencies along with multiple stakeholders working together to accomplish a monumental task. Ms. Graham reiterated Audubon’s support and offered assistance if needed in Washington to move the project forward.

Mr. Sargent asked Ms. Graham for her opinion regarding Mr. Mike Collins’ concern that the PIR had not been released to the public prior to it being scheduled before the Governing Board. Ms. Graham responded that the process had been fully inclusive and there was ample opportunity for the public to comment when

the draft PIR was released. Ms. Graham stated that the release of the final PIR does not fit in line with how the process works and could not think of any examples where the PIR was released to the public prior to being vetted publicly by the Governing Board.

Mike Collins stated that he understands that the process has worked a certain way in the past but stated that water quality issues need to be resolved before 200,000 acre feet of water can flow south into Everglades National Park. Mr. Sargent asked Mr. Collins to explain his position regarding timing due to the project not being scheduled to start until seventeen to twenty years in the future. Mr. Collins stated that there are more immediate needs that should be addressed now prior to going forward with CEPP especially federal water quality criteria.

Joshua Kellam asked for clarification on what might constitute a major change to the PIR that would prompt the item to go back before the Governing Board. Mr. Teets responded that if the PIR goes through the thirty-day public and agency review process and significant changes are called for especially after it goes through the DEP coordinated State Clearinghouse where all state agencies have an opportunity to comment, significant changes may need to come back before WRAC and to the Governing Board. Changes would be deemed significant by reviewing state agencies.

W. Ray Scott, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS), expressed concern with moving forward with CEPP as significant issues raised during the public vetting of the draft PIR have not been resolved in the final PIR. Mr. Scott stated that moving forward with a plan this large and dependent on taxpayer dollars with so many unresolved issues may not be sound public policy. Mr. Scott also stated that in order for FDEP to approve a project, it must be permissible and meet the state savings clause among other things. He also made mention of making a commitment to avoid violating the savings clause as it relates to maintaining flood protection for citizens of Miami-Dade. Mr. Scott stated that he did not agree with moving forward with the project at this time due to so many uncertainties.

James Humble, Miami-Dade Agricultural Practices Advisory Board, pointed out that language referencing flood protection on lands in Miami-Dade has changed from “maintain authorized flood protection” to “maintain current flood protection,” which is less flood protection than originally intended for citizens and farmers in Miami-Dade.

Malcolm “Bubba” Wade, US Sugar Corporation, stated that the PIR should be released for public input prior to Governing Board approval to avoid possible future conflict. Mr. Wade also questioned which projects that are part of CEPP can be implemented early in the process. He also stated that language should be clearer in regards to state funding being contingent on approval of the legislature and the Governor and then finally Governing Board approval of fiscal year expenditures.

Mr. Sargent asked Mr. Teets how different the PIR is from the draft PIR. Mr. Teets responded that the plan is the same and the issues are resolved with the exception of Appendix A. Mr. Teets said that the operations and maintenance cost share, the phasing of projects that are part of the plan, and the list of outstanding concerns referenced in his presentation had all been addressed as planned. Mr. Teets stated that more detail was added to specific sections as requested by commenters.

Mr. Moran asked Mr. Teets if there was any adverse effect to the Savings Clause in the final PIR. Mr. Teets responded that there was no impact to the Savings Clause. Mr. Moran expressed his concern that the Governing Board is being asked to approve a plan that may not have been fully vetted by stakeholders especially concerning Appendix A.

Mark Perry recalled the process dealing with the five-year process of the initial CERP project from conception to authorization. He stated that he is pleased with this accelerated CEPP project process to

implement about six components from the original CERP plan. Mr. Perry said that this is a long term process that will have adjustments along the way.

Shannon Estenoz stated that DOI has spent hundreds of hours with the public for the past two years on an enhanced public process for CEPP. She said that the scope of CEPP was purposefully kept narrow and serves as an example of innovation in project planning and project bundling including conveyance, storage and water quality to begin to move water south. Ms. Estenoz reminded everyone that CEPP is not a full implementation of CERP, instead it is a longitudinal slice of storage, treatment through Restoration Strategies, decompartmentalization and seepage management.

James Erskine stated that conceptually CEPP is a viable project that is needed to move water south and that a resolution is needed for a path forward. He stated that the cost share agreements between the state and the Corps is encouraging for meeting water quality in the Everglades and on Tribal Lands. Mr. Erskine stated that slide six of the presentation has a discrepancy between timing and implementation of the projects and Section 1A of the resolution. Mr. Erskine stated that meeting the WQBEL and meeting water quality standards are two different ideas that need to be reconciled. Mr. Erskine stated that he is not comfortable banking that putting CEPP components on hold until Restoration Strategies is complete may not ensure that the WQBEL will be met. Mr. Erskine said that the group needs to focus some restoration efforts on the western basis while CEPP and Restoration Strategies is being implemented. Mr. Erskine stated that the “whereas” clause in the draft resolution referencing the Miccosukee Tribe implies agreement and the Miccosukee Tribe has not formally stated agreement on CEPP so he asked that staff strike or reword the language.

Joe Capra stated that the CEPP planning process has worked and commended Ms. Estenoz and Ms. Graham for articulating the positive outcomes of the process. He also commended District staff and Corps staff for their hard work in bringing the project forward. Mr. Capra expressed the need to move forward with CEPP and letting others know how important the project is to the citizens of Florida and the importance of outreach in the community and the state.

Bubba Wade stated that he agreed that CEPP should move forward and that projects needed to be identified that should be constructed during the next seventeen years while waiting for CEPP to be implemented. Mr. Wade expressed concerns with the number of stakeholders who had concerns with not being able to see the final PIR document before the Governing Board votes on it. He stated that the process of releasing the final PIR after Governing Board approval should be reviewed.

Mr. Moran stated that the compliance methodology needed to be revised and that members should use their influence to have the TOC look into its calculation methods. He stated that simply devising a different way of calculating the 10ppb requirement could speed up the process of delivering water needed in Everglades National Park.

Jane Graham stated that after the Governing Board approves the CEPP PIR it will go to the Civil Works Review Board and after that there is a thirty-day review for the public to have another opportunity to comment on the PIR. Ms. Graham stated that Everglades Restoration is a project that the world is paying attention to and CEPP is a bold step in moving restoration forward.

LTC Greco stated that the draft CEPP PIR has gone through an extensive public process, received numerous comments, changes have been incorporated in the document based on public comment. He stated that the Corps is statutorily obligated to address the comments supplied and somehow incorporate those comments into the report and that process is currently underway and the underlying reason it has not been released to the public. LTC Greco said that he and the Corps is anxious to move CEPP to the next steps so that the public and all stakeholders get another chance to ensure that a general consensus has been reached going forward.

Commissioner Shelley Vana, Palm Beach County Board of County Commissioners, stated the importance of moving CEPP forward.

Shannon Estenoz said that the window for getting projects included in WRDA is still narrowly open and that is the reason that there is a sense of urgency in getting CEPP approved.

#### Public Comment

Caroline McLaughlin, National Parks Conservation Association, expressed support for CEPP.

Martha Musgrove, Florida Wildlife Federation, expressed support for CEPP and the process. Ms. Musgrove stated that a letter of financial capability is not a commitment and should not be confused with a PPA.

5. Temperince Morgan, Division Director, Everglades Policy and Coordination, laid the framework for the WRAC's Project Prioritization exercise. Temperince provided members a project table and summary of the criteria that staff used for initial project rankings.

#### WRAC Comment

Albrey Arrington, Loxahatchee River District, asked where the Mecca Replacement Feature project was captured. Ms. Morgan stated that Mecca is part of Restoration Strategies and is funded through that program, therefore it is not listed separately on the Prioritization table and is captured under the Restoration Strategies row.

Nancy Payton asked where Contract 8 could be found on the spreadsheet. Ms. Morgan responded that Contract 8 is part of C-111 South Dade project and could be found there.

James Humble asked if the C-111 Spreader Canal listed on the table is the one that had been plugged and stated that since plugging the canal, water levels are now the same and S-178 cannot provide flood protection where it exists. Mr. Humble stated that two land owners are being negatively impacted due to the plug and no one is making note of the issue. Mr. Humble pointed out that flooding in south Dade is indicated by very wet root columns with it rising to the surface of the land. Mr. Humble said that algae are now growing between crop rows and harm is being done to farmers in the area and those issues should be addressed. Ms. Morgan informed Mr. Humble that several meetings are being planned to discuss these issues in the coming weeks.

Mark Perry asked for a description of the Rolling Meadows Wetland Restoration project. Ms. Morgan provided that this wetland restoration project is located along the Kissimmee River and the first portion is being funded with mitigation funds. Mr. Perry asked that it be clearly identified as part of Kissimmee River Restoration. Mr. Perry also questioned the letters used to identify correlations to the original CERP projects in the yellow book to which Mr. Teets explained how the two corresponded. Mr. Perry asked that members receive a list of the original 68 CERP components including the corresponding letters for comparison.

Nancy Payton asked about the process and for a list of acronyms and their translations. Ms. Payton expressed concerns that Picayune Strand is listed as "to maintain flood control" and its original purpose was not flood control. Staff stated that they would address that concern. Ms. Payton also asked that the Picayune Strand listing include that the taxpayers of Collier county are paying the fifty percent state share of funding for operation and maintenance.

Jason Liechty, Alternate to Commissioner Kristin Jacobs, stated that Broward county would like to see the Broward County Water Preserve Areas (BCWPA) move from a category B project to a category A project and expressed general support of all of the CERP projects.

Kurt Harclerode, Alternate to Pam Keyes, expressed a desire to place C-43 Reservoir in a higher category on the prioritization list.

Barbara Miedema asked if there is a way to separate category A into subgroups that delineate level of completion, court mandates and statutory mandate. Ms. Miedema stated that all projects that are implemented should have significant restoration benefits so that likely does not need to be included as a qualifier. Ms. Miedema suggested broadening terminology that discusses projects as being part of the Everglades Forever Act (EFA) and/or the Everglades Construction Project.

Ray Scott questioned CEPP as part of the solution to reaching EFA goals, he stated that he thought EFA goals had to be met prior to CEPP implementation. Ms. Morgan clarified that in addition to the water quality objectives in the EFA there are also hydrologic restoration objectives listed in the EFA that should also be considered during the prioritization exercise. Ms. Morgan stated that projects such as the C-111 would fall into that category as well if they affect Everglades National Park or Water Conservation Areas. Mr. Scott then asked why some Indian River Lagoon (IRL projects) were listed as contributing EFA goals while others are listed as contributing to Northern Everglades and Estuary Protection Act (NEEPA) goals.

Chad Kennedy suggested that instead of having the column list “helps to achieve NEEPA or EFA goals” it should read “does not help to achieve” certain goals. Mr. Kennedy also suggested adding a column or some way to indicate pre-requisite projects.

Mr. Collins stated that the project prioritization table represents a huge amount of work and commended the efforts of District staff in completing the table. Mr. Collins stated that the criteria for ranking ignored cost. He stated that less costly projects are ranked below high-cost projects. Mr. Collins also asked what resources are impacted today that can be completed sooner. He said that considering those facts might shed a different light to ranking of certain projects. Mr. Collins also discussed CEPP and Florida Bay as it relates to actual impact and benefits.

Josh Kellam asked how WRAC members are expected to move forward with prioritizing each category. Ms. Morgan said that WRAC input and Governing Board input would all contribute to project rankings. Mr. Kellam asked that known completion dates be included in the table especially if there are court orders, contracts in place and other clearly defined end dates associated with projects. Mr. Kellam reiterated the statement made by Mr. Collins regarding project rankings based on cost. He stated that it may make more sense to rank less costly projects ahead of very expensive projects so that interim progress can be made.

Dan DeLisi, Chief of Staff, SFWMD, stated that it may not be beneficial to spend a lot of time ranking category A projects since they are mandated, court ordered and in some level of completion. He stated that efforts should be focused on category B and C projects.

Mr. Sargent stated that category A projects were important to list on the table in consideration to category B and C projects. The category A projects provide a necessary history and outline

Michelle Diffenderfer asked for a definition of “critical to CERP cost share balance.” Ms. Morgan stated that those projects must move forward in order for reimbursement. Ms. Diffenderfer stated that members be cautious if they decide to focus only on category A projects in the ranking as some of those projects might have some flexibility for shifting and projects in the B and C categories may be able to be re-categorized based on many factors. Ms. Diffenderfer added that she would like more projects in the western basin area located near the Seminole Tribe be included on the table.



Bubba Wade commented that staff had done a good job and that this type of table has been needed for a long time. He stated that

Mark Perry stated that local contributions to project funding be listed on the table. Mr. Perry maintained that all projects on the table should be considered for ranking, not just B and C category projects. Mr. Perry also asked why CEPP was separated into three sub-categories. Ms. Morgan stated that this was done based on WRAC member feed-back and listing CEPP this way captures the way it is laid out in the PIR. Mr. Perry asked how the Lake Okeechobee ASR Pilot project got included on the table. Ms. Morgan replied that there is lots of stakeholder interest in ASR and the use of pilot project results may be helpful as part of the prioritization process and stated that ASR was a component of the original restudy. Mr. Perry asked for a simple chart containing the original 68 CERP components, as listed in the Yellow Book, and codes that correspond to the current prioritization table and status of the projects along with comments as to why each component made the new table or why it did not.

Jane Graham stated that although she is a little unclear of how the results of this process will actually be used, she would like to emphasize the importance of science guiding the process and decisions that are made in regards to a dry Everglades National Park, wildlife habitat and water quality. Ms. Graham stated that clear coordination would be needed between the South Florida Water Management District, the Corps and stakeholders. Ms. Graham agreed that subdividing projects into components to provide an avenue to receive the most benefit. Ms. Graham asked if the Cutler Flowway could be segmented out of the Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands Phase 1 and added to category A as it was part of Acceler8 and the same sentiment follows with some components of the BCWPA like the C-11 project. Ms. Graham suggested that projects listed under the Northern Everglades Protection program and Lake Okeechobee capture how much phosphorus would be reduced instead of the broad check box that is currently listed. Ms. Graham also stated that there are regulatory projects or programs that effect Lake Okeechobee BMP implementation that should be prioritized very high.

Joe Capra expressed appreciation to the staff for pulling the information together and asked if private firms could come in and do any of the projects on the list. Ms. Morgan answered that Public Private Partnerships had been undertaken in the past and could be considered at some point in the future.

A discussion was had regarding the numbering of the projects on the spreadsheet. Ms. Morgan clarified that there is no ranking within categories. Currently the projects are listed alphabetically in each category and there should not be a false sense of ordering in relation to the table. The numbers are strictly a feature of excel and in no way reflect a ranking of projects. Additional discussion was had regarding projects not included on the list, such as Tamiami Trail Next Steps, in which other agencies are designated as lead. There was discussion about projects that might be included in the Integrated Delivery Schedule (IDS) and a subset of IDS called the Master Implementation Sequencing Plan (MISP) that are also not reflected on the WRAC prioritization list. Members and staff also briefly discussed the District's taxpayers as being part of the Lake Okeechobee Basin or the Big Cypress Basin.

Barbara Miedema stated that she has concerns that water for the built system has been eroded from CERP over time, such as the deep water reservoir in the Everglades Agricultural Area (EAA) that was supposed to make water available for the natural system as well as the built environment, C-43 was also supposed to be available for both and now that water has been reserved for the River, ASR pilot project has been frozen, so there is a fundamental disconnect between being able to sustain a growing population and the natural system and not having to give up one for the other. Ms. Miedema stated the idea for CERP was to enlarge the entire water pie so that there would not be competition for resources. Ms. Miedema stated that there should be some information provided to inform the community and stakeholders how these holes would be plugged. Ms. Morgan informed Ms. Miedema that there may be opportunities to interject certain operation

and maintenance projects that may provide water supply benefits and she should provide that feedback for inclusion on the table.

Josh Kellam expressed concerns regarding water supply to address growth. Mr. Kellam echoed Mr. Capra's statement that staff consider using private entities to build projects. Ms. Morgan stated that dispersed water storage projects are a form of public private partnerships that might be considered.

Members and staff discussed the five instances where dispersed water projects appeared on the prioritization table clarifying the projects that were already under contract or slated for future contracts and the ones that were in public ownership that would or could be used in the future for interim benefits.

Newton Cook stated that some projects included in the Central Everglades Planning Project south may need to be further broken down. He also stated that the project information, now that it has been gathered, should be utilized and worked as a corporation might and not put on a shelf.

Ms. Morgan closed the discussion by encouraging members to take the table back and really dig into the information and be prepared to provide feedback at the WRAC meeting in May.

#### Public Comment

Jacqui Thurlow-Lippisch, Sewall's Point Commission, stated her support of CEPP and thanked staff for developing the table of projects to be used during the prioritization process. She stated that the list is a good tool to be used by elected officials, teachers and others. Ms. Thurlow-Lippisch asked if the projects could list how much water would go south if they were implemented. She also asked for a map with stars that would indicate project location within the South Florida Water Management District so that people would know how many projects are being planned in their areas.

#### 6. General Public Comment

None.

#### 7. Final WRAC Member Comment

WRAC members discussed possible agenda items for the upcoming joint WRAC / South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force meeting.

#### 8. Adjourn

Mr. Sargent announced that the next monthly WRAC meeting is scheduled for May 6th in Palm Beach County at the Royal Palm Cultural Center where we will continue our Project Prioritization exercise. There will also be a joint WRAC/South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force meeting immediately following the regular WRAC meeting. The Task Force will hold its meeting on May 7th in the same location.